



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/810,481	03/19/2001	Katsumi Ikegami	OHG 123	8966

7590 06/15/2006

RABIN & CHAMPAGNE, P.C.

Suite 500

1101 14th Street

Washington, DC 20005

EXAMINER

STORK, KYLE R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/810,481

Applicant(s)

IKEGAMI, KATSUMI

Examiner

Kyle R. Stork

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 April 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3-6 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This final rejection is in response to the remarks filed 24 April 2006.
2. Claims 1-7 and 58 are pending. Claims 19-20, 33-34, 48-51, and 55-57 are withdrawn as being directed toward a non-elected invention. Claims 1 and 58 are independent. The rejection of claim 1-7 and 58 under 35 U.S.C. 112 has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment. The rejection of claims 1-7 and 58 under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 35 U.S.C. 103 under Ernst (Using Netscape, 1995) and further in view of Chang et al. (US 6532541, filed 1999, patent 2003, hereafter Chang) and Microsoft® Excel 2000 (1999, hereafter Excel) have been withdrawn.

Drawings

3. The drawings remain objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show the elements stored within a document format database as described in the specification. The applicant's specification discloses storing a wide array of information within the database, however, Figure 13 only discloses storing coordinates.
4. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). Figures 13, 27, 40, 42, 53-54, and 57 do not have element numbers necessary for the understanding of the invention.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate

prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1 and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong (US 2001/0046307, filed 30 April 1998) and further in view of He et al. (US 6088451, filed 28 June 1996, hereafter He).

As per independent claim 1, Wong discloses an image display system comprising:

- An original image holding device for holding first image data (paragraph 0032: Here, an original image is contained in an apparatus for inserting watermarks)
- A computer communicating with the original image holding device, the computer comprising an image display device (paragraph 0011: Here, the watermarking apparatus is connected to a computer to display images)
- A storing device for storing second data corresponding to the first image data and suitable for display by the image display device (paragraph 0001: Here, the watermark is associated with a first image as an identifier)
- Wherein the computer reads out the second data from the storing device, displays on the image display device the second data read out from the storing device and detects alterations to the second data read out from the storing device (paragraphs 0007 and 0011)

Wong's method specifically relates to invisible watermarks (paragraph 0007). However, Wong discloses both invisible and visible watermarks (paragraph 0002: Here, watermarks may be visible or invisible. Visible watermarks are inserted into an image). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined visible watermarks with Wong, since it would have made it more difficult to remove the watermark image from the first image (Wong: paragraph 0002).

Wong fails to specifically disclose:

- Wherein if an alteration to the second data read out from the storing device is detected, the computer additionally requests the original data holding device to transfer the first data
- Wherein the original data holding device transfers the first data to the computer in accordance with an original data transfer request from the computer
- Wherein the display device displays the first data transferred to the computer

However, He discloses:

- Wherein if an alteration to the second data read out from the storing device is detected, the computer additionally requests the original data holding device to transfer the first data (column 22, lines 40-67)
- Wherein the original data holding device transfers the first data to the computer in accordance with an original data transfer request from the computer (column 22, lines 40-67)
- Wherein the display device displays the first data transferred to the computer (column 22, lines 40-67)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined He with Wong, since it would have allowed a user to maintain the integrity of the data received (He: column 22, lines 25-67).

As per dependent claim 2, Wong and He disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Wong further discloses wherein the image display device displays an indication that first image data has been

obtained since there has been an alteration to the second image data, along with displaying the first image data transferred thereto (paragraph 0011).

As per independent claim 58, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 1. Claim 58 is similarly rejected.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 3-7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2 and 58 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

9. Applicant's arguments filed 24 April 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that, "this application has already received an examination on its merits, so further examination of the claims directed to the non-elected invention would not impose an undue burden on the Patent and Trademark Office (page 2)." However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. The amendments filed 29 November 2005 changed the scope of the claims substantially. The amendments clarified that claims 1-7 and 58 were drawn to segmenting an image to detect alterations of an

image, properly classified in class 713, subclass 176. However, claims 19-20, 33-34, 48-51, and 55-57 were drawn to authorization levels for redacted regions, properly classified in class 713, subclass 166. Since the search required for claims 1-7 and 58 is distinct from the search required for claims 19-20, 33-34, 48-51, and 55-57, the restriction is proper.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R. Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kyle R Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

krS


CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER